

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/05/2004

SERIAL NO: 09/336,424  
DOCKET NO: 149-0112US

## REMARKS

This paper is intended to be a complete response to the above-identified Office Action mailed on April 5, 2004. It is believed that no fee is required. If fees are required, however, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct the necessary charges from Deposit Account 501927/149-0112US.

Claims 1-52 were pending. Claims 1-52 were rejected. No claim is amended, cancelled or added in this Reply.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-52 in current form were initially rejected in an Office Action dated 5/6/2003, in view of Agranat (USP 5,973,696), Blinn (USP 5,897,622), Levine (USP 5,745,681) and Saliba (USP 6,052,710) *individually*. Claims 1-52 were rejected again in a Final Office Action dated 10/14/2004 and in an Advisory Office Action dated 12/15/2003 in view of Agranat for the same reasons. An Appeal Brief was filed on 1/28/2004. The final rejections against the pending claims are now withdrawn. As best understood, it appears the primary reason for the above rejections is that the cited references disclose generic web browsers, web servers, and data communication between web browsers and web servers. Since the Examiner has withdrawn those rejections, Applicant submits that a disclosure of a generic web browser, a web server or their interaction do not make the pending claims unpatentable.

In the current Office Action dated 4/5/2004, the pending claims are rejected in view of Yoshikawa (USP 6,061,516). Although it is called "Online Application Processing System," Yoshikawa discloses a generic web browser, a generic web server and their interactions. Applicant submits that the reasons for, and the basis of, the current rejections are the same as the Examiner's earlier rejections and therefore should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests the current rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

Applicant would like to draw the Examiner's attention again to the relevant field of the current invention. It is about "Protocol Technology for Client/Server Environment." The current invention is directed to application software that is a combination of client software and server software running on client computers and server computers. Although web browsers and web servers work primarily in a client/server environment, this is quite different from the

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/05/2004

SERIAL NO: 09/336,424  
DOCKET NO: 149-0112US

technology disclosed and claimed in the current application. As for web browsers/web servers, they operate independently and the communications between the two are typically interactive. On the other hand, in a method of the current invention, a message has at least three distinctive parts, which are communicated together within a single message from one device to another.

Applicant would also like to draw the Examiner's attention to the meanings of "definition," "state changes," and "command" as they are used and *defined* in the claims. Just because a prior art reference contains these four words, does not mean that the reference discloses the invention of the current application.

More specifically, Applicant submits that Yoshikawa, like all other references cited by the Examiner, does not disclose all aspects of the claimed invention. As noted in Applicant's Appeal Brief, claim 1 reads:

1. A method, comprising:
  - a) [1] *receiving* a [3] *message* that was [2] *sent from a remote device*, [4] *said message comprising* a [5] *definition*, a [6] *state change*, and a [7] *command*, said definition defining [8] *a fixed aspect* of [9] *a user environment*, said state change describing a change in [10] *a non-fixed aspect* of said user environment, said command being a [11] *directive* that causes a function to be performed; and,
  - b) [12] *processing* said definition [13] *before* said state change and said command are processed,  
[14] *processing* said state change before said command is processed, and  
[15] *processing* said command.

(Numbers with "[ ]" are added for easy identification in later discussion.)

Claim Element	Objects/elements disclosed in Yoshikawa, as cited by the Examiner	Appellant' Comments
[1] <i>receiving</i>	Display device, browser	Assume, for the sake of argument, the local display device or a browser is performing the act of " <i>receiving</i> ."
[2] <i>sent from a remote device</i>	Host computer, Web server	Assume, for the sake of argument, the host or a web server is the " <i>remote device</i> ."

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/05/2004

SERIAL NO: 09/336,424  
DOCKET NO: 149-0112US

Claim Element	Objects/elements disclosed in Yoshikawa, as cited by the Examiner	Appellant' Comments
[3]message	Screen, Figs. 3 and 4 Window, Figs. 18 and 19	All of the text or images appeared on a screen are not received from the host computer or a web server, thus can not be in <i>a single message</i> . For example, the user input is from a user, not from the host computer. User input is sent from the browser or the local terminal to the host or web server.
[4]said message comprising		" <i>Said message</i> " must contain at least the three recited characteristics: [5] <i>definition</i> , [6] <i>state change</i> and [7] <i>command</i> . It is not clear whether "name," "user input," and "send command" are received at the same time by a "display device" or a "web server" to constitute a "message." It is clear that "user input" is sent from a browser to the server, not received from a "web server."
[5]Definition	Name, Figs. 3, 4, items 80 and 110	Assume, for the sake of argument, that "name" is a "definition."
[6]State change	Transfer No., Figs. 3, 4, items 82 and 112, input field	User input is received from a user, not a "web server" or a host computer. Therefore, user input cannot be a "State change."
[7]Command	Fig. 4, item 119, send	Assume, for the sake of argument, the button "send" is the command.
[8]Definition defining a fixed aspect of a user environment		"Name" has nothing to do with a "user environment."
[9] user environment		"Name" has nothing to do with a "user environment."
[10]State change describing a change in a non-fixed aspect of said user environment		Part number or user input has nothing to do with non-fixed aspect of a/the user environment and cannot, therefore, be a "state change."

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/05/2004

SERIAL NO: 09/336,424  
DOCKET NO: 149-0112US

Claim Element	Objects/elements disclosed in Yoshikawa, as cited by the Examiner	Appellant' Comments
[11] <i>Command being a directive that causes a function to be performed</i>		<p>"Send" is a button for a user to initiate a function. It is not a "directive" that causes a function to be performed when it is sent by the Host/server to the "display device" or "browser."</p> <p>When the "send" button in a screen is received by the browser, the browser does not do anything other than display it on the screen. There is no function performed. Once the send button is pressed by a user, an instruction may be sent to the web server but this is not sent by the web server and cannot be part of a message sent by the web server.</p>
[12] <i>processing</i>	Figs. 9 item 143 C10:45-C11:56 C13:10-39	<p>The cited text describes "screen definitions," i.e., how individual regions on a screen are displayed on a display device or a browser. All described "processing" is done by a host/server, <i>before</i> a screen is even sent to a display device or a browser to be displayed.</p> <p>Also, not all items displayed on a screen are received at the same time. The variables (user inputs) are changing constantly.</p>
[13] <i>Definition</i>	Fig. 9 item 143 C10:45-C11:56 C13:10-39	See comment above.
[14] <i>state change</i>	C10:45-C11:56 C13:10-39	The processing described in the cited text is about how to show various items on a display device or browser. The described actions are processed <i>before</i> being received by the display device or browser.
[15] <i>Command</i>	C13:10-C14:22	Nothing in the cited text describes a sequence, where a "command being a directive that causes a function to be performed" is processed last, <i>after</i> processing the other two items "definition" and "state change."

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/05/2004

SERIAL NO: 09/336,424  
DOCKET NO: 149-0112US

Applicant submits that the Examiner has not clearly identified all of the above claim limitations or their equivalents in the cited reference. Applicant submits that the Examiner will not be able to do so, because Yoshikawa does not disclose all of the claim limitations. Consequently, claim 1 is allowable in view of Yoshikawa.

All other pending claims have at least the same limitations as in claim 1. Therefore, they are also allowable.

As to claim 12, Yoshikawa does not disclose anything new that the Examiner's earlier references did not already disclose or describe. In one embodiment, Yoshikawa discloses a display device (monitor) and host computer. There is no software program running on the display device, so there cannot be a dependency between the software programs running on a local device (display device) and a remote device (host computer). (C5:31-C6:58) In another embodiment, Yoshikawa replaces the display device with a GUI processing program (C3:20-C4:4), such as a web browser (C17:40-46). As discussed in earlier Replies, a web browser and a web server do not have any dependency between them. Therefore, Yoshikawa does not anticipate claim 12 or make claim 12 obvious. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection against claim 12 be withdrawn.

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION OF 04/05/2004

SERIAL NO: 09/336,424  
DOCKET NO: 149-0112US

## CONCLUSIONS

Reconsideration and allowance of pending claims 1-52 in light of the above remarks is respectfully requested. If, after considering this reply, the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be beneficial towards advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed.

Respectfully submitted,

4/21/2004  
Date



Liangang (Mark) Ye  
Reg. No. 48,276  
Email: [mye@counselIP.com](mailto:mye@counselIP.com)  
Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.  
20333 SH 249, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77070  
Voice: 832-446-2407  
Facsimile: 832-446-2424